

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, April 28, 2008**

1. CONVENE: 7:06 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member McNamara.
3. ROLL CALL: President Cook, Vice President Kohlstrand, Board Members Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, Lynch and McNamara.

Also present were Jon Biggs, Planning Services Manager, Assistant City Attorney Farimah Faiz.

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the meeting of November 13, 2007 (continued from April 14, 2008).

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that on pages 1 and 2, the Assistant City Attorney's last name was misspelled "Faz," and should be corrected to read "Faiz."

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the first bullet point in the second-to-last paragraph on page 2 should be changed to read: "1. The square footage from the prior approval would be reduced because *the* Target store was ~~not~~*no longer needed because Target had withdrawn its application.*"

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that page 5, paragraph 6, read, "Board member Lynch stated it was important to understand the current parking configuration versus the new configuration. He noted that he had spoken with the City Manager's office to apprise them that the applicant was willing to work with the City to address the sidewalk issue on Park Street." She inquired whether Board member Lynch had received a response to his discussion. Board member Lynch replied that he would provide the information when it was available.

President Cook noted that page 6, paragraph 2, because she agreed with some aspects of the plan, but not others, the language should be changed to read: "~~President Cook noted that she generally agreed with the plan.~~ She noted that she was fine with the increased height on the Mervyn's building, ~~but that it seemed lopsided, because without the additional height, the center would now look lopsided because some heights had been increased on the new, improved parts of the center.~~"

President Cook noted that further into the same paragraph, the following language "She believed the deck could be made more attractive..." referred to her comment that she was not sure about the parking structure yet, and would need to give it more thought.

President Cook noted that the next sentence in the same paragraph should be changed to read, “She inquired about Dr. Perry’s corner, and was concerned about circulation *and pedestrian safety*.”

President Cook noted that the last several sentences in the same paragraph “She believed the elevation *for the Mervyn’s building* looked good, and would like updated traffic counts. She agreed with Board member Ezzy Ashcraft about the crosswalk, and *was very concerned that the crosswalks at Shoreline Drive did not connect with the pedestrian walkways at the center* ~~and did not like the current crosswalk at Shoreline.~~” She noted that was not an issue so much for the center, as it was for the Public Works Department. She added that the crosswalks led right into iceplant and did not connect.

Board Member Cunningham moved to approve the minutes of November 13, 2007, as amended.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Noes: 0 Absent: 0 Abstain: 2 (Kohlstrand, McNamara). The motion passed.

- b. Minutes for the meeting of March 24, 2008 (pending).

These minutes will be considered at a later meeting.

- c. Minutes for the meeting of April 14, 2008 (pending).

These minutes will be considered at a later meeting.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

Mr. Biggs suggested that Items 9-A and 9-B be reversed in order on the agenda at the request of the Public Works Department.

6. PRESENTATIONS:

- a. Staff Communications – Future Agendas

Mr. Biggs provided an update on future agenda items.

Board member Lynch requested that given the volume of information that would be required for the May 12, 2008, public hearing of the Harbor Bay Village VI Project GPA and EIR, that the following meeting have a light agenda to handle overflow from that hearing. He anticipated that there would be a great deal of public interest in that item, and did not believe the Planning Board would be able to make a determination that evening. Mr. Biggs noted that staff would do its best to make the documentation available to the Board as early as possible, and that it would be made available at the Planning Department as early as possible for the public as well.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she had a similar request for the following meeting for the Draft Pedestrian Plan. She noted that City staff's Gail Payne had done a lot of work on that document, and that it may take two meetings to cover it.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that for future agenda scheduling, whenever an item had a voluminous amount of reading, that staff could determine when the documents would be ready, and give the Planning Board members a longer window of time to review the documents before the meeting.

President Cook noted that the office condominium project at Harbor Bay went to City Council on appeal, and the appeal was rejected, so project approval was upheld. She noted that she had spoken to an appellant, who expressed concern about the lack of sufficient notice. She had told President Cook that over 1,300 had signed a petition. President Cook believed that there should be more time to inform the public, as well as time to review the materials.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that the 300-foot radius noticing had been complied with, and added that there were a number of homeowners associations within Harbor Bay Isle, as well as a Master Association. She suggested that the Association put themselves on the list to receive the packet online.

Board member Lynch noted that about two years ago, the Board held a discussion regarding revising how it interacted with the public in terms of noticing. They believed that given the staff needs, that a break in the schedule be taken, and a Planning Board agenda projecting forward a month was suggested. He believed it would be simple to do, and would not take any additional dollars or staff resources; he noted that management scheduling would be able to accomplish that goal.

b. Zoning Administrator Report – Meeting of April 15, 2008.

Mr. Biggs provided an update on the latest Zoning Administrator Report, and noted that the Action Agenda was also included in the packet.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR: None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

9-B. Capital Improvement Projects Fiscal Year 2008-2009 and 2009-2010

The Planning Board will review the proposed Capital Improvement Projects Proposal for the next two year City Budget. The Planning Board will consider whether the proposed expenditure plan is consistent with the City of Alameda General Plan.

Ms. Kozisek, Public Works, summarized the staff report. The next public hearing will be held at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 30, 2008, and will also be available on the City website. The following meetings will be noted on the website as well.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Helen Sause noted that she hoped the 27 projects reduced the 101 projects. She inquired when the Sewer Master Plan would be completed. She inquired where the Estuary Crossing study would occur, and wondered what the study was about. She inquired whether the Tree Master Plan fell under this work, and whether there would be implementation from it.

Ms. Kozisek replied that the 27 projects were not taken out of the 101 projects, which were anticipated for the future. She noted that Public Works planned to finish the Sewer Master Plan by the end of 2008. She noted that the Estuary Crossing study was in response to the problems encountered by pedestrians and bicyclists when traveling through the Tubes. The study was intended to find other possible ways to get across the Estuary, and the environmental phase was intended to examine all possibilities before picking one that had the least adverse impact. She noted that the Tree Master Plan was underway, and that the trees were being measured. She added that had already been funded, and was not included in this project. She expected that would be completed in several months.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding the genesis of the Public Benefit Score, Ms. Kozisek replied that it was a concept that had been around for a few years. The score was looked at, but is not the final score upon which a determination was made. A higher score has more benefits, such as economic or visual benefits, cultural/historic/recreation potential or preservation, or environmental impacts.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the City Hall Tower retrofit was given a score of 76, which is higher than either bridge maintenance, storm drain repair or water taxi vessel procurement. She added that the cost would be \$430,000, and noted that the City's budget restrictions were well-known. She understood it was a private funding effort, and that it was listed in the unfunded list, and inquired why it received a score of 76.

Ms. Kozisek replied that the complete list was not available at this time, but added that private funding gave the project a higher score. The project on City Hall would benefit all citizens, while the storm drains were not noticed unless they flooded onto someone's property.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether the Board would like to continue this item in order to allow sufficient time to read the material, Board member Ezzy Ashcraft replied that would be helpful.

Board member Lynch inquired about the acronyms and the presentation of the data with respect to fees received and projected expenditures. Ms. Kozisek replied that they were

conservative estimates developed by the Finance Department. He inquired whether staff would share the information from the public meetings as they are conducted; Ms. Kozisek replied that would occur.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she would look forward to receiving the background information. She requested that Ms. Kozisek comment on the gas tax, which was being raided by the State and used on the State level. She inquired whether \$240,000 was the amount being received by the City. Ms. Kozisek replied that was only the part that went toward Capital Improvements; the remainder went to the operating budget.

Vice President Kohlstrand inquired about Bicycle and Pedestrian projects, Ms. Kozisek discussed the budget allocation for those uses and noted that the details on the prioritizations would be available mid-year.

Board member Lynch complimented Ms. Kozisek on her thorough and methodical approach to this project.

Board member McNamara noted that for 2008-09, \$24 million was approved, with \$16 million for the Stargell Extension, a one-time project, and 2009-10 identified \$6 million for Public Works. She inquired whether the \$2 million differential would change, or whether the City should expect dwindling funds over the next few years.

Ms. Kozisek noted that the funds may decrease, and that staff took a more conservative approach. She added that there were frequently mid-year appropriations to address, and that some of the Measure B funds were held in reserve to act as a local match for potential grants.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft encouraged Ms. Kozisek to provide explanations for technical acronyms for the public. Ms. Kozisek replied that the Board received a shortened version of the document that would be seen by the public, which would explain the technical terms.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham whether any Climate Protection Task Force findings were included in the document, Ms. Kozisek replied that buildings over 3 million square feet should be LEED-rated. Board member Cunningham added that the findings of the Task Force were valuable, and believed that they should be reflected in some follow-through. He noted that there were a number of recommendations that would benefit the community, such as the reduction of solid waste through the green building ordinance. She noted that she would look further into that matter.

Board member Cunningham believed that future projects identified by the Planning Board should be detailed in the CIP, and would like to see more details. Ms. Kozisek noted that City Council would have a workshop on this issue in a month, and was unsure whether there would be enough time to include this discussion. She noted that it was better for the entire City's funding to have a complete list of wish-list projects, and encouraged the Planning Board to submit these to the Unfunded Projects List as a planning tool.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the StopWaste.org version of the green building ordinance had been approved at the last meeting, and had been sent to City Council. She was concerned that the Task Force had not been consulted for the wish list. Board member Cunningham replied that the green building ordinance contained only one of the findings.

Vice President Kohlstrand would like more information on the Estuary study. She noted that Director Woodbury had attended the joint meeting with the City Council, and returned to the Planning Board for a mid-year discussion. She hoped that would become a regular occurrence to discuss how projects fit into the CIP. She noted that she would abstain because there was nothing in the document that discussed conformance to the General Plan.

President Cook agreed with Vice President Kohlstrand, and would like further clarification of the Planning Board's role in this plan. She was not prepared to say it was consistent with the General Plan, but that it was no reflection on the work done by Public Works. Ms. Kozisek noted that there was almost no new construction in the CIP, and that it was generally reconstructing or repairing existing items.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether it would be possible to bifurcate the CIP report so the Planning Board may have more time to consider the full information.

Mr. Biggs inquired whether the Plan would go to the City Council for approval. Ms. Kozisek replied that they would begin to hold workshops in late May; there will be one or two meetings to discuss the CIP, followed by a vote.

President Cook requested that the Board be allowed the time to examine the unfunded projects and decide on a course of action.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft concurred with that suggestion, and inquired about the other Boards and Commissions that may want to weigh in.

Mr. Biggs suggested continuing this item to May 12, 2008, and given the time constraint, he did not know whether they would be able to distribute the CIP to the Boards and Commissions in time.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that the Climate Protection Task Force be made a priority in examining the unfunded projects.

President Cook inquired whether the Planning Board had the authority to recommend that a project be placed on the funded or unfunded list for review. Ms. Kozisek noted that staff would put any request on the unfunded list, including proposals from the general public. To get on the proposed list, it must go through the City Manager and Public Works, and money must be available for it.

President Cook suggested that this item be deferred, and that a meeting be held with the Planning Director to explain how the Board may have meaningful input into the capital budgeting process.

Vice President Kohlstrand would like to go further, and facilitate the Board's input into the process.

Board member McNamara suggested that the Board adhere to the letter of the law and determine whether it was consistent with the General Plan or not.

Board member Cunningham agreed with Board member McNamara's suggestion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft was comfortable voting because she had read the entire packet. She expressed concern about the \$430,000 proposed expenditure of the clocktower at City Hall, and she believed that was somewhat out of priority. She could make the finding that the CIP was consistent with the General Plan.

Board Member Cunningham moved to find that the CIP list for the Fiscal Year 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 was in conformance with the General Plan.

Board member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Noes: 0 Absent: 0 Abstain: 2 (Cook, Kohlstrand). The motion passed.

9-A. PLN08-0155 – 2201 South Shore Center – Applicant – Harsch Investment Realty. Permit includes the renovation of Building 900 and site improvements in the area immediately adjacent to the building. Current review is limited to the architecture design and does not include the use or operational aspects of this building. Building 900 currently contains a single retail store (Mervyn's) and two smaller tenant spaces. A portion of the existing retail store will be converted into five smaller shops. The existing building height ranges from approximately 25 feet to 28 feet. After renovation, the typical building height would range from 25 feet to 29 feet with parapets over the entranceways extending up to a maximum height of 33.5 feet. Site improvements include extensive landscaping, new benches and bicycle parking facilities. (JB/DG).

Mr. Biggs presented the staff report and displayed a PowerPoint presentation.

Board member Cunningham noted that the staff report did not mention the PDA, and the ability to raise the height of the structure. He acknowledged that was not part of the approval.

Mr. Biggs noted that the Planning Board will look at the PDA in the future, and if the second story was confined with the architecture of the building, it would be defined within the building permit process. The height could not be increased without a design review.

Board member Cunningham noted that his comments had been addressed, and that he was happy with what he saw.

Board member Lynch concurred.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook about the process, Mr. Biggs replied that the amendment would need to come before the applicant could add the second floor space. Any modifications to the exterior of the building would be subject to design review.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that when she went to Town Centre, she was continually impressed and pleased with how beautiful it looked. She would recommend people visit it to see the spring flowers. She also liked the building materials and the design. She was pleased to see people strolling through the courtyard. She did not find the design of the Kohl's building to be consistent with the high level of design of the other buildings. She will be happy to see the old Mervyn's building gone. She believed the long, uninterrupted expanses of walls be replaced with some windows, although she understood that retail windows could be problematic because the retailer would lose display space. She believed windows would make walking along this area a more interesting experience for the pedestrian. She inquired why there was no entrance on the west elevation, and noted that created an even longer blank expanse on that side. She believed the south elevation facing the interior mall also needed some glass window displays to look in, to break up the expanse of building material. She liked the east elevation.

Vice President Kohlstrand echoed Board member Ezzy Ashcraft's concerns regarding the blank wall and lack of access to the store on the west side.

President Cook echoed Board member Ezzy Ashcraft's concerns.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft believed the lettering of the Kohl's sign looked very large, and inquired how big it was.

Board member McNamara inquired about bike racks, and would like more to be installed at the center.

The public hearing was opened.

Randy [Kytes], applicant, was pleased that this had been a very collaborative process, and that the series of challenging meetings had been productive. He noted that much of the wall space was needed by the store for internal display. He noted that Kohl's typically operated with a single entry into the store, and he noted that they would be able to make an accommodation for two entries. The entrances were originally on the west and north sides, and the applicant was asked to move them to the mall side. The owner of the company held an impassioned meeting with the Centre architects and Kohl's architects, and requested a number of upgrades and further articulation in the building. He noted that it was difficult to express a three-dimensional view in the elevations, and added that the trellises would step off the building substantially.

Mr. Kytes suggested that Kohl's be allowed to do what they do, in order to for them to continue to be successful. They discussed adding a layer of pedestrian amenity, such as

art plaques. He noted that Kohl's did not merchandise show windows, and he believed the center could install fountains or art in lieu of putting in a show window that would likely be covered by a graphic. He believed the current design was sufficiently articulated and followed the flavor of the center. He was confident that a more interesting walk would be possible. They would also maintain shop space along the mall with a strong pedestrian walkway. He noted that the height of the sign was 12 inches taller than Safeway, and added that he would find out the total square footage of the sign. He noted that Kohl's originally wanted an entryway on the west, but Harsch felt that it would be more valuable on the mall.

Monique Lee, Harsch, displayed and described the bike rack area.

President Cook requested that the applicant address the color schemes of the building, and noted that there was a lot of beige in the elevations.

Jeff [Stohl], Shrader and Holt, Kohl's project architect, noted that they originally had the entrance plan to make it pedestrian friendly. The developer requested that the entrance face the pedestrian mall, and Kohl's has since added trellis elements, landscaping and pilasters to break it up. He noted that they had been working with Field Paoli on the color scheme, and the elevations presented muted earth tones. They would like to keep that general scheme, and added that they could pop out some more true to life colors.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft whether color and material boards had been brought, Mr. [Stohl] replied that they used materials consistent with the existing Towne Centre buildings. They were refacing the aggregate with new wood paneling and arbors, as well as a tile selection near the entrance that also featured glazing.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that the positive transition of Towne Centre had featured a lot more transparency, and noted that Harsch captured that concept where the small-scale buildings were being added in the corner. She was concerned that the warehouse look would interrupt the existing Center visuals.

Mr. Stohl noted that Kohl's used the interior of the walls to display merchandise from within the store. He noted that the store needed as much inside wall space as possible to follow the merchandising plans.

Jeff Pool, Manager of New Store Development, Kohl's Department Store, noted that four of the five Kohl's stores that would be developed in 2008 would be 88,000 square feet. He noted that sometimes there was a gap regarding the nature of Kohl's business. He noted that there were 15 stores within the San Francisco metropolitan area, and that they were publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange with annual sales of \$16 billion. Their mission statement was to be a family-focused, family-oriented specialty department store for the nation. He noted that Mervyn's was 84,000 square feet. He noted that their plan for the interior wall displays created a struggle in 2006 as the developer's needs were set against the store's need to create sufficient revenue. He noted that they have recently found ways to accommodate form and function. He noted that they had no show

windows in a normal prototype store, and that there were store windows at the store entrance, as well as within the store, containing mannequins. He did not believe it would be possible to create additional store windows. He noted that they wished to put their best foot forward in the Centre, and did not believe the PowerPoint presentation did justice to the colors and articulation that had been presented. He assured the Board that they would be able to present what the Board needed to make a decision.

Board member McNamara expressed concern about the massing and bland color of the building, which she believed was already an eyesore. She liked the landscaping efforts throughout the center, and believed that it would be continued in this part of the project.

Mr. Kyte noted that Harsch was very protective and critical of the center's design. He believed that the landscaping and the trellises on the south side of Bed, Bath & Beyond would have sufficed. He noted that they knew how to create a pedestrian amenity, and that they knew how to get people to flow through the shopping center, as well as to stay, linger and enjoy the experience. He noted that they would make every piece of this center right before it was completed.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft believed there was a solution to the Board's desire for display windows, as well as landscaping and the trellis. She believed that the Board's expectations were placed very high by the previous phases of the center. She did not want to see long expanses of wall, and that the public wanted a beautiful place to shop. She did not want to see a warehouse on the corner of the development. She inquired whether there were restrictions on the truck hours.

Mr. Pool noted that Mervyn's had the same width with a recessed dock, and described the shift of the dock area in order to increase the sales area. He noted that the Mervyn's door accommodated two trucks. Mr. Kyte added that trash compactors were also included.

Mr. Pool expressed concern that the posters that were initially very attractive in an initial presentation before the City may become yellowed and curled in the window. He noted that it may be a function of training of managers for poster maintenance. He noted that they wanted to put the entrance on the west side, but that Harsch did not allow it. He believed that the illumination and the trellises would improve the presentation than depending on Kohl's to use existing design programs. He was concerned that the lack of a national, regional or local program for shop windows would lead to a shopworn look over time.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding truck hours, Mr. Pool replied that they would probably be less than Safeway's. Kohl's had two or three deliveries weekly, with the exception of the holiday season.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Kohlstrand regarding the concrete, Mr. Pool described the transition from colored concrete to the asphalt in that area.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether they had looked at brick-like surfaces, Board member Cunningham replied that the weight of the truckloads required that the surface be made of concrete. Mr. Kyte replied they had looked at stamped concrete, but they were problematic with the weight of the truckloads.

President Cook noted that she shares some of the same concerns as Board member Ezzy Ashcraft. She added that while she normally abstained from a piecemeal development, she was in favor of this item moving forward, particularly in light of the CIP moving forward. She noted that sales tax revenue was very important to the City, and had seen that Mervyn's had not done as good a job in that area. She shared the concerns regarding the windows, and trusted that the developer would keep it on a human scale. She appreciated any design additions that could enliven the colors. She was initially very concerned about not having a west-facing door, but understood that would be a concern with respect to shoplifting.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether there were any overhangs above the trellises between the loading dock and the Kohl's sign. She would like to see the Kohl's letter in a smaller size, particularly given the flatness of the façade. She requested that the letters be the same size as Safeway. Mr. Pool noted that the traffic flow along Otis was significantly blocked, and they had asked for Kohl's identification as the largest store in the center; Harsch had denied that request. He noted that Kohl's square footage was larger than Safeway, and that the sign was intended to be seen by passing traffic on Otis Drive.

Mike Corbitt, Harsch Development, noted that the letters on the Mervyn's sign were six and five feet, respectively. He noted that it was important for the store to be seen.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft would like there to be more visual interest on the exterior. She inquired where the art panels and fountains would be located. Mr. Kyte replied that history panels would be mounted on the building on the west side. Board member Ezzy Ashcraft did not believe she could support this unless there was a window or some other point of interest on the blank wall. Mr. Kyte replied that the Board had not approved locations for other panels, and that they had installed many of them. He added that the art panels have been purchased already, and that they intended to include an appropriate level of pedestrian amenities and landscape. He assured the Board that they would create a pedestrian-friendly appearance, and estimated that two panels would be placed on the west elevation in a yet-to-be-determined location, and two on the south elevation between the Kohl's entry and the West End of the mall. He noted that they had other pieces of art that had not been sited yet, and that those pieces exceeded the City's requirements.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Draft Planning Board Resolution to approve a permit that includes the renovation of Building 900 and site improvements in the area immediately adjacent to the building. Current review is limited to the architecture design and does not include the use or operational aspects of this building. Building 900

currently contains a single retail store (Mervyn's) and two smaller tenant spaces. A portion of the existing retail store will be converted into five smaller shops. The existing building height ranges from approximately 25 feet to 28 feet. After renovation, the typical building height would range from 25 feet to 29 feet with parapets over the entranceways extending up to a maximum height of 33.5 feet. Site improvements include extensive landscaping, new benches and bicycle parking facilities.

President Cook requested an amendment to add the following language in Condition 3: "This area shall not be used for vehicle parking, *loading or unloading, staging* or material storage

The amendment was acceptable to the maker and seconder of the motion.

Board member Lynch seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Noes: 1 (Ezzy Ashcraft). The motion passed.

9-C. Housing Element/Measure A Forum Summary

For Planning Board review and discussion. This item is for discussion purposes only.

Mr. Biggs summarized the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

There were none.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Vice President Kohlstrand believed the summary accurately reflected what had happened at the forum, and hoped that there would be more of a summary from the staff perspective.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that page 1, paragraph 4, of the Preface did not seem to be accurate, which read: "In March 2007, the Planning Board appointed an *ad hoc* committee. . . . A group of Alameda residents appealed the Planning Board's committee appointment to the City Council, reflecting the community's passion about preserving Measure A." She did not believe that sentence belonged in the document, and stated that an appeal made by seven people could not be extrapolated to speak for the City's population of 75,000. She believed the process was accurate.

Board member Lynch noted that this item was prepared by Planning Director Cathy Woodbury, and asked how the comment made by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft could be integrated. He believed it reflected an opinion and should be struck.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft believed the sentence she quoted was a conclusionary statement, and should be removed from the document.

Mr. Biggs replied that the sentence could be stricken from the document.

Board member Lynch advised that that was a direction to staff, rather than a request, and inquired about the process to make a correction.

Board member Cunningham inquired where this process would go in the future. Mr. Biggs described the general process, and noted that SunCal would take the input and bring it back in a summary to the City

President Cook did not want this discussion to continue if SunCal were not to be in the picture. She believed further discussion of this matter was very important, particularly the tradeoffs faced on Alameda Point.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft would like to hear more about forum-based codes, which would not supplant the discussion about Measure A, but she believed it was a timely topic. She would like to agendize that topic for a future meeting.

President Cook noted that developers liked certainty, and this discussion would help in future development. She noted that a bright side of an economic downturn allowed the City time to refine these items.

Vice President Kohlstrand inquired about the status of the Housing Element; she noted that it was important to have the forum summary as a record, but believed that the ultimate meaning for the community was missing from the document.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the event cost \$41,500, and hoped that covered the entire process, not just that day.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that it included the preparation and organization time, as well as presentations and lunch.

President Cook would like to hear back from the Planning Director to discuss the work program issues and the policy issues, particularly as they relate to the Housing Element.

Board member Lynch would like a response from the Planning Director on this item, and suggested that a Director's Report be placed on the agenda. He expressed concern that the Planning Director did not attend the meeting, which he believed was significant. He believed the Director's Report would fall into the policy category that would enable the Director to clarify the policy issues to the Board.

Board member Lynch inquired whether this had been circulated as a draft document. Mr. Biggs replied that he did not know. Board member Lynch believed that staff should consider circulating this document as a draft to the individuals who participated for accuracy, and then produce the document.

Board member Lynch moved that the document be returned to the Planning Board in draft form with a presentation by the Planning Director.

Vice President Kohlstrand wished to amend the motion to state that the Planning Director would be able to address the issues brought forward during the Board's discussion.

President Cook wished to further amend the motion to include a document to forward to City Council.

Vice President Kohlstrand seconded the amended motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Noes: 0. The motion passed.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

a. **Report on Alameda Point Station Area Plan**

Mr. Biggs presented the staff report, and noted that it was provided to the City Council by the City Manager. He noted that the report was available on the City's website.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. David Howard suggested that this study was justified on the basis of having to respond to the Oakland-Chinatown lawsuit against the City of Alameda. He noted that Section 3.3 of the Settlement Agreement called for a study of transportation alternatives, which had been presented by the Planning Director many times that outside money was used to conduct the study to satisfy the requirements of the agreement. He hoped that the Planning Board or Planning staff would refer this study to the Oakland-Chinatown Advisory Committee for review, as part of responding to this agreement. He noted the concerns expressed by the Chinatown Agreement as part of the settlement agreement regarding automobile traffic. He noted that the transit-enhanced third alternative translated to twelve buses per hour coming out of Alameda Point, presumably mostly coming through the Tube. He believed the Advisory would want to review whether they intended to trade automobiles for buses.

Mr. Howard addressed Board member Cunningham's previous comments about the balance of jobs and housing at Alameda Point, and noted that the concept was not adequately addressed in the report. He did not observe any efforts in Alameda to attract a big campus user. Regarding the Housing Element, he understood that 71% of Alameda residents left the Island to get to work each day. He noted that the top ten employers in Alameda employed only about 4,000 people out of a day population of 38,000 people. He believed that looking at more housing at Alameda Point would aggravate the current housing/jobs balance. He supported the idea of reusing the buildings, and bringing jobs at a range of pay scales that would not require people to leave the Island; he believed that might solve some of the traffic and transit considerations.

Mr. Howard expressed concern that the report continued to promulgate the notion which he did not believe had been substantiated or justified, that Measure A precluded any historic buildings from being reused. He spoke specifically of the Bachelor Executive Quarters and the Bachelor Officer Quarters. He cited Article 3 of Chapter 30 of the Alameda Municipal Code (Development Regulations): Multiple Dwelling Units – Rehabilitation, remodeling or alteration of existing structures provides that existing multiple dwelling units may be rehabilitated or remodeled, provided they comply with the provisions of the chapter, and no building shall be altered to increase the number of multiple dwelling units contained therein.” He believed that legislation has been conveniently ignored by every study of what to do with the BEQ and the BOQ. He believed it was not substantiated that the BEQ and the BOQ could not be reused through that legislation. He believed that should be studied, and has heard Planning staff and

consultants state that Measure A precluded the use of any of those buildings. He believed it was possible those two buildings could be reused. He noted that his letter was submitted online.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

President Cook inquired whether a multiple-dwelling unit must include separate kitchens, and understood that the BEQ and BOQ served meals cafeteria-style.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that would entail something that had not been in the buildings before.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Kohlstrand regarding the City's findings being integrated with the City of Oakland and the Chinatown Task Force, Mr. Biggs replied that he did not have the answer to that question. She would like some further understanding of that issue for informational purposes.

President Cook requested that Mr. Thomas update the Board at the next meeting.

Board member Lynch inquired whether a motion would be needed for this item, because it was the byproduct of a settlement. He requested that staff return with an answer to the Board, and suggested that if it was the product of a settlement agreement, he believed there was some duty to deliver it. If not, he inquired whether the Board should deliver it in the spirit of neighborliness.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that it was the summary of the first hearing in a process that has not concluded. Mr. Biggs noted that Mr. Thomas could report to the Board on that item.

No action was taken.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft hoped that Alameda was not the only body performing studies on this issue, and that there was reciprocity on Oakland's part.

President Cook suggested that this follow-up be included in Staff Communications for the next meeting.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that a meeting of the Pedestrian Task Force had been held; the Task Force included members of the Planning Board, the Transportation Commission, the Housing Commission and the Accessibility Commission. She noted that information will come to the Planning Board at the end of May. She encouraged the Board and the public to look at the work performed by the Task Force in documenting existing facilities in Alameda. She noted that there was considerable detail, and that their challenge would be to figure out how to implement the plans to improve pedestrian amenities in Alameda.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that Thursday, May 15, would be Bike to Work Day. She added that May 21 would be the grand opening of the Alameda Theater, and that it would be a black-tie event.

President Cook noted that Saturday, May 24, would be Family Day at the theater.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

This meeting was audio and video taped.